



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/701,180	11/05/2003	Michael Raley	111325-500100	6377
22204	7590	08/14/2009	EXAMINER	
NIXON PEABODY, LLP			DISTEFANO, GREGORY A	
401 9TH STREET, NW			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
SUITE 900			2175	
WASHINGTON, DC 20004-2128			MAIL DATE	
			08/14/2009	
			DELIVERY MODE	
			PAPER	

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/701,180	RALEY ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	GREGORY A. DISTEFANO	2175	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) GREGORY A. DISTEFANO. (3)\_\_\_\_\_.

(2) Joey Yao. (4)\_\_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 06 August 2009.

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference  
c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.  
If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: 1,25,79,80,90 and 91.

Identification of prior art discussed: Thomas, Nishio, Weisberg, Bacso.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Current application of prior art and possible amendments were discussed. The examiner agreed that previous rejection to claim 1 under 35 U.S.C 103 over Thomas in view of Nishio was insufficient. Arguments were discuss to the support for playing two audio contents on a single channel with regard to the rejection of claims 25 and 90 under 35 U.S.C. 112. Arguments were discussed regarding providing a benefit to a user with regard to claims 79 and 92.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/GREGORY A DISTEFANO/  
Examiner, Art Unit 2175

William L. Bashore/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2175